



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/934,367	09/19/97	NEEDLEMAN	P MON-103.0-(6)

WELSH AND KATZ LTD  
120 SOUTH RIVERSIDE PLAZA  
22ND FLOOR  
CHICAGO IL 60606

HM12/0611

EXAMINER

EYLER, Y

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1642

10

DATE MAILED:

06/11/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
08/934,367

Applicant(s)  
Needleman et al.

Examiner  
Yvonne Eyler

Group Art Unit  
1642

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Yvonne Eyler

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Edward Gamson

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Jun 9, 1999

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed:

None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Rittenshous could be sworn behing by declaratons such as were effective in parent application, now allowed and suspended. Sequences comprising or encoding "a immunogen" needed to be better defined. "having" is vague and indefinite because it is unclear if it is open or closed. Consists essentially of in claim 13 is ok because it refers to number of residues since it is right before "about". Support for the number of residues and the ranges of positions needs to be in the specification. Vehicle in claim 17 is unclear and also support needs to be in specification. Product claims read on cDNA in mammalian expression vector.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

*Yvonne Eyler*

6/9/99

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.